DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 439 484 EA 030 280

AUTHOR Wells, Zella; Scollay, Susan J.; Rinehart, James S.
TITLE A Comparison of Job Responsibilities of Kentucky's 1997-98 Induction-Year Intern Principals and Assistant Principals.
PUB DATE 1999-11-00
NOTE 41p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association (Point Clear, AL, November 17-19, 1999).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes; *Assistant Principals; Elementary Secondary Education; Instructional Leadership; *Internship Programs; *Management Development; *Principals; School Administration
IDENTIFIERS *Kentucky

ABSTRACT

This paper draws on research conducted to achieve three general purposes: (1) determine the characteristics of Kentucky's 1997-98 principal and assistant principal interns and whether their work differed; (2) ascertain whether work differences existed among interns according to gender or school level--elementary, middle, or high; and (3) to investigate possible changes, including effects of reform initiatives such as high-stakes accountability on the roles of 1997-98 first-year principal and assistant principal interns. For the study, all principal interns and assistant principal interns that were employed in Kentucky's public schools during the 1997-98 school year were surveyed. An analysis of the 134 surveys that were returned (87 percent) found that the self-reported administrative duties of principal interns were significantly different from those reported by assistant principal interns. Assistant principals did not assume responsibility for the same administrative duties or "work" that principal interns performed. Not only was there a disparity in the work, but there was a pervasive difference in the magnitude or degree of assistant principal involvement. Only 4 of 80 duties were identified by over 90 percent of assistant principal interns compared to 38 so identified by principal interns. The results suggest that the assistant principalship may provide less than "ideal" training for all facets of the principalship. (Contains 43 references.) (RJM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 439 484

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Z. Wells
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

A COMPARISON OF JOB RESPONSIBILITIES OF KENTUCKY'S 1997-98 INDUCTION-YEAR INTERN PRINCIPALS AND ASSISTANT PRINCIPALS

Zella Wells, Ed.D.
Johnson County Schools
Paintsville, Kentucky 41240
zwells@johnson.k12.ky.us

Susan J. Scollay, Ph.D.
University of Kentucky
Lexington, Kentucky
scollay@pop.uky.edu

James S. Rinehart, Ph.D.
University of Kentucky
Lexington, Kentucky
jsrine01@pop.uky.edu

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the
Mid-South Educational Research Association
Point Clear, Alabama
November 17-19, 1999

EA 030280

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

INTRODUCTION

During the 1990s Kentucky has become one of the country's leading states in the implementation of comprehensive and systemic education reform initiatives, including high-stakes school and district accountability (Kannapel, Aagaard, and Coe, 1997; Southern Regional Education Board, 1998; White, 1998). Because Kentucky holds each individual school accountable for its students' academic performance, the overall effectiveness of principals and assistant principals seems crucial to a school's success on student assessments. In addition to high-stakes accountability, Kentucky has adopted many other reform initiatives that are perceived to have fundamentally affected education and the work of educators. Teachers and administrators face increased demands on staff time as well as expectations for schools' continuous improvement on state assessments. Because of Kentucky's sustained efforts at comprehensive education reform, the ability to determine and compare the actual, on-the-job work of intern principals and assistant principals actively engaged in implementing reform initiatives serves to deepen current understanding of both roles.

This paper is based on findings derived from research conducted to achieve three general purposes: (1) to determine the nature of Kentucky's 1997-98 principal and assistant principal interns' and if their work differed; (2) to ascertain if work differences existed among assistant principal interns according to gender or to school level – elementary, middle, or high; and (3) to investigate possible changes, including effects of reform initiatives such as high-stakes accountability on the roles (administrative duties) of 1997-98 first-year principal and assistant principal interns.

Findings from this study inform the continued contradiction between the espoused value of the assistant principalship as an ideal training ground for the principalship and the actual duties performed in 1997-98 by assistant principal interns in Kentucky (Kindsvatter and Tosi, 1971; Laughery, 1959; Kelly, 1987).

BACKGROUND

In contrast to most other states' pre-service internships, Kentucky principals and assistant principals are required to complete a one-year internship during their first year of employment as building-level administrators. Interns are provided with the opportunity for on-the-job learning under the supervision of a three-person committee comprised of a principal mentor, a university representative, and the school district's superintendent or designee. For successful completion of the internship and for full licensure, the intern must demonstrate mastery on all six of the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) administrator standards, Kentucky's recently-adopted standards (Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium, 1996; 704 Kentucky Administrative Regulation 20:470; Kentucky Department of Education, 1997a).

Educators assisting Kentucky interns have offered anecdotal accounts that often assistant principal interns have difficulty demonstrating proficiency on all administrator standards because they are not delegated a wide range of administrative responsibilities. These undocumented observations are consistent with research findings noting that assistant principals typically have been restricted to managerial-type duties such as student discipline and attendance (Auclair, 1991; Austin, 1972; Gorton, 1987; Greenfield,

1985; Greenfield, Marshall, and Reed, 1986; Iannaccone, 1985; Kelly, 1987; Mizelle, 1995; Panyako and Rorie, 1987; Reed and Himmler, 1985; Smith, 1987).

From comprehensive duty inventories, comparisons were made between the duty rankings of Kentucky principal and assistant principal interns to determine if their work differed and if so, the nature and extent of the difference. Similar comparisons were made to ascertain if work differences existed among assistant principal interns according to gender or to school level – elementary, middle, or high. The comparisons of Kentucky's secondary assistant principal interns' duties and responsibilities to previous national, NASSP samples and to a pre-education reform, Kentucky sample offered insight into the effects of reform initiatives on job practices and expectations (Austin and Brown, 1970, Kalla, 1983, Pellicer et al., 1988).

Findings from this study also have significance beyond immediate practice in Kentucky. Some researchers have observed (Austin and Brown, 1970; Clemons, 1989) and at least one theorist has claimed (Mizelle, 1995) that due to implementation of education reform initiatives as well as to other influences, the assistant principal's role is evolving beyond the traditional responsibilities of student discipline and attendance. Data from this research offer limited support to those claims. Similarly, the extent (or lack) of the school-level or gender-related differences found in the work of Kentucky assistant principal interns added a different and previously undocumented dimension to the knowledge base in those areas.

Internships have long been a recognized and commonly accepted means of organizational socialization, a "process by which one is taught and learns the 'ropes' of a particular organizational role" (Van Maanan and Schein, 1979, p. 211). In particular,

principal internships are considered to be highly effective ways for novice principals to learn critical skills (Schmeider, McGrevin, and Townley, 1994). Several theorists link the benefits of the internship with adult learning theory that emphasizes active learner involvement, reflective thinking, and experiential learning (Kolb, 1984; LaCost and Pounder, 1987).

Consistently throughout the literature, the assistant principalship is perceived to be a transitory, entry-level position that serves as a training ground for the principalship or higher administrative position (Austin and Brown, 1970; Golanda, 1991; Gorton and Kattman, 1987; Kelly, 1987; Kindsvatter and Tosi, 1971; Laughery, 1959; Marshall 1992; Marshall and Greenfield, 1985). However, the literature documents that many view the assistant principalship as lacking clear conceptualization or definition in relationship to schools' organizational structures (Gillespie, 1961; Reed and Himmler, 1985; Smith, 1987). Mostly the position has entailed supervision of students (discipline and attendance), oversight of extra-curricular events, and other non-instructional duties. Consequently, because of limited opportunities for assistant principals to develop as instructional leaders, others have questioned the adequacy of the position as an effective preparation for the principalship and higher administrative positions (Brown and Rentschler, 1973; Coppedge, 1968; Kelly, 1987; Marshall, 1992).

Because no empirical study of the role of Kentucky's principal interns had been completed since the enactment of the Kentucky Education Reform Act (KERA) in 1990, a current demographic and detailed job duty profile of Kentucky principal and assistant principal interns was compiled. Additionally, the work of Kentucky secondary assistant principal interns was compared to national survey findings and to a pre-KERA study of

Kentucky secondary assistant principals to explore possible changes in the work of assistant principals over the past 30 years.

Research Questions

Subsumed within the three overall purposes were six specific research questions to be answered by this study. These included:

I. What is the nature of the work of Kentucky principal and assistant principal interns and does their work differ?
   A. What is the current demographic and job duty profile of principal and assistant principal interns?
   B. How does the work of assistant principal interns compare to that of principal interns?

II. To what extent, if any, are there school-level or gender-related differences in the work of assistant principal interns?
   A. How do the administrative duties of male and female assistant principal interns compare?
   B. Do intern assistant principal administrative duties vary significantly by school level – elementary, middle, or high?

III. What evidence, if any, exists, to suggest that the nature of assistant principals' work has changed over the past 30 years?
   A. How do secondary assistant principal interns' administrative duties compare to those reported in the 1970 and 1988 National Association of Secondary Principals' (NASSP) national surveys (Austin and Brown, 1970; Pellicer et al., 1988)?
   B. How do Kentucky intern assistant principals' administrative duties compare to those reported in a 1983 study of Kentucky assistant principals (Kalla, 1983)?

METHODOLOGY

Population

All 1997-98 principal and assistant principal interns employed in Kentucky's K-12 public schools serving traditional student populations (N = 154) were surveyed. Interns working in church schools, alternative, technical, and vocational schools, preschools, day treatment centers, and small schools with only head teachers were excluded from the study because of their unique educational and operational settings. There were 134 survey respondents (87%).

Table 1

Respondents Classified by Job Title, Gender, and School Level* (n = 134)

	Principals		Assistant Principals	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
School Level	n	n	n	n
Elementary	11	26	6	6
Middle	1	2	14	5
High	3	1	25	15
K-12	2	0	1	2
K-8	6	5	0	1
Other (7-12)	0	2	0	0
Total	23	36	46	29

* Source: Intern survey responses.

Instrumentation

Replicating the format of two previous NASSP national surveys of principals and assistant principals, the instrument utilized in this study was a descriptive questionnaire consisting of two parts – a demographic section containing 21 questions and a job duty

analysis consisting of 80 administrative duties. Sixty-five of the 80 items replicated the job analysis portion of the 1987 NASSP survey, and a focus group of incumbent and former principals added 15 more items to reflect more completely the principalship in Kentucky. Survey participants responded to the job duty analysis and demographic questions by selecting one of several fixed-response options or by filling in blanks (Austin and Brown, 1970; Pellicer et al., 1988).

Data Collection Procedures

Intern names, districts, and school assignments were obtained from the Kentucky Department of Education's Division of Testing and Internship, and school addresses were taken from the 1997-98 Kentucky Schools Directory (Kentucky Department of Education, 1997b). Survey packets were mailed to 154 beginning principals and assistant principals participating in the 1997-98 Kentucky Principal Internship Program (KPIP). Packets contained a cover letter, a two-part questionnaire (demographics and job analysis), a stamped and addressed return envelope, and a participation incentive (a one-dollar bill).

The initial mailing produced 104 returned surveys and two follow-up letters yielded 30 additional returns. Postcards returned by 16 non-respondents failed to reveal any systematic patterns or reasons for non-participation. A total of 134 surveys (87%) were used in the data analysis.

Data Analysis

The responses from the demographic section of the survey provided descriptive data about the interns. Results for most demographic questions were displayed in frequency

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

tables and also summarized in narrative form. Means and standard deviations were calculated for interval-level responses such as age, years of classroom experience, KPIP program evaluation rating, and school enrollment. Information from the demographic section and salient data from the job analysis portion were used to profile Kentucky principal and assistant principal interns and to delineate their duties and responsibilities.

The job analysis section of the survey contained 80 administrative duties for which respondents indicated the degree of their responsibility on each. The response option format was a 4-point Likert-type scale assigned the following numerical codes: (a) 0 – Not Applicable, (b) 1 – Slight Responsibility; (3) 2 – Shared Responsibility; (4) 3 – Full Responsibility.

The same coding and classification system utilized in the 1965 and 1987 NASSP studies was replicated in operationally defining what was meant by principal and assistant principal intern "work," i.e., their administrative "duties" or "responsibilities," (Austin and Brown, 1970; Pellicer et al., 1988). Responses on the 80 items that were marked "not applicable" or "slight responsibility" were grouped together and were not considered to be the "work" of the respondents. These items were not used in identifying the duties of principal and assistant principal interns. Administrative duties for which more than 50% of respondents marked either "shared" or "full" responsibility were re-coded into a single category and ranked in descending order based on the percentage of respondents who had indicated either option ("shared" or "full"). Thus, the items that met the 50% responsibility criterion, referred to as the "50% criterion rule", were defined to be the "work" or the administrative duties of principal and assistant principal interns.

Subsequently these items were used to answer all research questions pertaining to intern work.

All statistical analyses were performed using SPSS® Base 7.5 (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) software, and a significance level of $\alpha = .05$ was set for all tests of significant difference. On tasks that satisfied the NASSP's 50% criterion rule, either a Mann-Whitney-U test or a Kruskal-Wallis test was conducted to analyze the rankings of specified groups for significant differences.

FINDINGS

Demographics

Based on the survey responses of participants in the 1997-98 Kentucky Principal Internship Program (KPIP), the demographic characteristics of principal and assistant principal interns are more similar than different (Table 2). Generally, principal and assistant principal interns are of the same age, race, and marital status. They have achieved similar levels of educational attainment and have the same ultimate career aspirations. Principal and assistant principal interns work full-time at schools governed by site-based councils, and the schools are likely to be located in rural or small town settings.

Table 2

1997-98 Principal and Assistant Principal Intern Demographics

Typical Principal Intern	Typical Assistant Principal Intern
Caucasian	Caucasian
Female	Male
Working at a SBDM elementary school	Working at a SBDM middle or high school
39 years of age	38 years of age
Married	Married
Working at rural or small town school	Working at rural or small town school
Formerly a teacher	Formerly a teacher
11 years classroom experience	13 years classroom experience
Master's degree + 30 hours	Master's degree + 30 hours
Principal or superintendent aspirations	Principal or superintendent aspirations
Rated the internship highly	Rated the internship highly

The most noteworthy demographic difference between the two groups of interns is that the majority of Kentucky's principal interns are females (60%), most of whom who work in elementary schools. In contrast, the majority of assistant principal interns are males (63%), who work predominantly in middle or secondary schools, although 40% of high school assistant principals are female. This percentage (40%) is twice that reported in 1988 (20%) for female high school principals (Pellicer et al., 1988). There are few minority principal ($n = 1$) or assistant principal ($n = 4$) interns. During the 1997-98 academic year, the number of assistant principal interns ($n = 89$) exceeded the number of principal interns ($n = 65$).

Intern Work

A comparison of the duty rankings obtained from the job analysis portion of the intern survey (Appendix A, Appendix B) reveals the work of principal and assistant principal interns to be significantly different, $z = -6.86$, $p = .00$. This disparity between

principal and assistant principal work is found at all school levels – elementary, middle, and high schools. Of the ten highest-ranked duties (Table 3), only three are common to both principal and assistant principal interns. These include: school policies (implementation); student discipline; and student and staff safety. Five of the ten highest-ranked assistant principal duties are those added to the 1998 survey by the focus group. These include: parent interaction/communication; student and staff safety; compliance with policies, laws, & regulations; chair committees for special needs students (504s,ARCs); development of school policies & procedures.

No significant differences in the work of principal interns are found when compared by school level. That is, the administrative duties of elementary principal interns are generally the same as the administrative duties of middle and high school principal interns. This similar-work finding is documented for assistant principal interns across school levels also. No overall significant differences are found between the administrative duties of male and female assistant principal interns. The only exception to this finding appears at the elementary school level where female assistant principal interns' administrative duties are significantly different from those of male intern colleagues.

Limited comparisons of assistant principal interns' rankings of administrative duties to those obtained in previous research indicate no significant differences among three related studies (Austin and Brown, 1970; Kalla, 1983; Pellicer et al., 1988). These limited comparisons exclude from statistical analysis all tasks that do not appear as

Table 3

Principal and Assistant Principal Interns' "Top Ten" Administrative Duties

Principal Duties[b] (Percentages[a])	Assistant Principal Duties[b] (Percentages[a])
1. Building use – school-related (100%)	1. Student discipline (96%)
2. School policies (implementation) (100%)	2. *Parent interaction/communication* (96.0%)
3. Student discipline (100%)	3. *Student & staff safety* (94.7%)
4. *Student & staff safety* (100%)	4. *Compliance with policies, laws, & regulations* (93.3%)
5. *Communication of school vision & mission* (100%)	5. School policies (implementation) (85.3%)
6. School budgets (100%)	6. Assemblies (84.0%)
7. Staff inservice (professional development) (100%)	7. Student attendance (82.7%)
8. Instructional methods (100%)	8. Special arrangements at start & close of school (82.7%)
9. *Development of 1998-2000 Consolidated Plan* (100%)	9. *Chair committees for special students (504s, ARCs)* (81.3%)
10. Evaluation of teachers (98.3%)	10. *Development of school policies & procedures* (81.3%)

[a] Percent of respondents indicating "shared" or "full" responsibility for duty.
[b] In regular type: Administrative duties included in the 1987 NASSP survey.
In italics: Administrative duties added by focus group to 1998 survey.

"ranked" duties in all studies being compared. There are numerous tasks (11) that meet the criteria for the "work" of assistant principals in the 1998 study but procedurally are excluded from the comparisons. By using hypothetical data for these non-ranked duties in the 1998 study, a comparison of the administrative duties between the 1998 and the 1987 rankings was simulated. The results narrowly missed being statistically significant, suggesting that if actual data were known for the 11 duties, a significant difference would have been found.

DISCUSSION

This study found the self-reported administrative duties of principal interns to be significantly different from those reported by assistant principal interns. This is an important finding since in recent years the majority of Kentucky building-level administrators complete their internships as assistant principals. Findings clearly demonstrate that assistant principals do not assume responsibility for the same administrative duties or "work" as principal interns. Not only is there a disparity in the work (the rankings of specific duties), but there was a pervasive difference in the magnitude or degree of assistant principal involvement, i.e., the percentage of assistant principals claiming shared or full responsibility for a given duty. Only four of 80 duties are identified by over 90% of assistant principal interns compared to 38 so identified by principal interns, i.e., only four duties are widely claimed by assistant principals as being their work (Appendix C). No duty is identified as a shared or full responsibility by all (100%) of the assistant principals, while nine duties are so identified by 100% of the principal interns. This is consistent with the findings of Austin and Brown (1970) and

Pellicer et al. (1988). Both studies documented assistant principals' limited involvement in a wide range of tasks. Another explanation for the low degree of assistant principal involvement on most administrative duties may be that the role of the assistant principal is not universally defined or clearly conceptualized (Bell, 1988; Gillespie, 1961; Marshall, 1993).

Traditionally, the assistant principalship has been viewed as an ideal training ground for the principalship (Ancell, 1987; Downing, 1983; Laughery, 1959; Marshall, 1992; Walker, Choy, and Tin, 1993). This seems also to be an implied assumption of the state law that requires first-time assistant principals as well as principals to participate in the Kentucky Principal Internship Program (Kentucky Revised Statutes, 161.027). Additionally, the KPIP Handbook states,

> Learning on the job under the supervision of qualified professionals at the end of an academic preparation program is well accepted as an important part of the preparation of many professional groups. Through such experiences, interns apply the theories, procedures, and skills learned in the classroom to real-world situations (Kentucky Department of Education, 1997a, p. 3).

However, findings from this study suggest that the assistant principalship may provide less than "ideal" training for all facets of the principalship. Kentucky's assistant principal interns appear to function more as "role players" or "designated hitters" on the administrative team, i.e., they are assigned specific duties rather than assume a wide range of responsibilities. Typically an assistant principal's duties are determined solely by the building principal and perhaps he or she is assigned duties to complement the work of the principal or to cover less "glamorous" administrative duties. (Austin and Brown, 1970; Pellicer et al., 1988). Consistent with the "role player" notion, if a principal delegates only those duties that complement his or her own work, it seems

logical that the degree of assistant principal responsibility on most other administrative duties would be diminished. Regardless of the reasons, the findings suggest that assistant principal interns may be underutilized, particularly in the area of instructional leadership.

An inspection of the top twenty duties listed in Appendix A and Appendix B for both principal and assistant principal interns, respectively, suggests that both roles have changed somewhat since job analyses conducted in the 1980s (Kalla, 1983; Pellicer et al., 1988). For both principal and assistant principal interns, eight of their 20 highest-ranked duties are tasks not even listed on earlier job inventory instruments. The eight new duties and their respective ranks are presented in Table 4.

Aside from the high rankings for "student & staff safety," the influence of various education reform initiatives on the work of the Kentucky interns, particularly principals, seems apparent. Tasks such as "communication of school vision & mission," "curriculum revision & alignment with core concepts," and "analysis of state assessment and accountability data," all hallmarks of high stakes assessment and accountability, apparently have been institutionalized and routinely performed by Kentucky building-level administrators. What is interesting to note, however, are differences in the general types of duties performed by both groups of interns. Principal interns claim responsibility for a number of instructional- or leadership-type tasks and duties, such as communication of school vision, instructional methods, etc. On the other hand, assistant principals' work appears to lie predominantly in the domain of organizational management, claiming responsibility for duties such as assemblies, teacher "duty" rosters, emergency arrangements, special arrangements at start & close of school, etc.

Seemingly, Kentucky assistant principal interns are given responsibility for duties of the same genre as assistant principals' perennial duties of student discipline and student attendance (Auclair, 1991; Austin, 1972; Gorton, 1987; Greenfield, 1985; Greenfield, Marshall, and Reed, 1986; Iannaccone, 1985; Kelly, 1987; Panyako and Rorie, 1987; Reed and Himmler, 1985; Smith, 1987). Thus, assistant principal interns, while clearly a part of the administrative team, appear to assume predominantly the role of an "organizational manager," rather than that of an "instructional leader." This finding is supported also by anecdotal accounts of university representatives serving on intern supervisory committees who report that assistant principal interns often have more limited opportunities (assigned job duties) than do their principal intern counterparts to demonstrate proficiency on all of Kentucky's administrator standards, the criterion for successful completion of the internship program. The practice of using assistant principals as "role players" certainly merits close review when full consideration is given to Kentucky's high-stakes accountability.

In addition to significant work differences between principal and assistant principal interns, the degree or magnitude of assistant principal involvement (as indicated by the percentage claiming full or shared responsibility for each task) is less than principal interns on nearly all administrative duties (Appendix A, Appendix B, and Appendix C). While perhaps the higher percentages of duty responsibility reported for principal interns can be explained because principals, by virtue of the position, proclaim ultimate responsibility for all administrative tasks, another interpretation would be that assistant principals are indeed seen only as "role players." Findings from this study suggest that the Kentucky assistant

principalship, while generally recognized as a necessary and essential position, continues to exhibit job duty limitations that challenge the notion that the position serves as ideal preparation for the principalship (Austin and Brown, 1970; Golanda, 1991; Gorton and Kattman, 1987; Kelly, 1987; Kindsvatter and Tosi, 1971; Laughery, 1959; Marshall, 1992; Marshall and Greenfield, 1985).

The work differences (job duties) between principal and assistant principal interns are found at all school levels – elementary middle, and high, i.e., the two jobs were fundamentally different. However in a somewhat unexpected finding, principal interns' work does not differ significantly across the three school levels. Elementary principal interns perform basically the same duties as do their middle and high school counterparts. This finding offers at least limited support for Kentucky's newly-adopted K-12 principals' certification. Previous principal certifications had been tri-level (elementary, middle, and high). Even more surprising, survey results also show that assistant principal interns perform generally the same administrative duties regardless of the school level to which assigned. Similarly, male and female assistant principal interns' work does not differ significantly except at the elementary school level where female assistant principals are found to have responsibility for an average of 17 more administrative duties than do their male counterparts.

That no significant differences are found between the work of male and female interns except at the elementary level may indicate work assignments are no longer linked to gender stereotypes. However, this overall finding is contrary to anecdotal accounts of intern committee members and to earlier research which found that females generally

performed administrative duties relating to curriculum and instruction, while males typically were assigned student disciplinary or supervisory duties (Ancell, 1987; Downing, 1983; Marshall, 1992). Females historically have held elementary principalships more often than principalships at other school levels (Biklen and Brannigan, 1980). Similarly, teaching at the elementary school level traditionally has been viewed as "woman's work." So perhaps elementary assistant principals automatically are ascribed more duties than male assistant principals simply because they fit the gender stereotype for that role.

Finally, in limited comparisons of Kentucky's 1997-98 assistant principal interns' duty rankings to those from three earlier studies, no significant differences in rankings are found (Austin and Brown, 1970; Kalla, 1983; Pellicer et al., 1988). Because statistical comparisons were restricted to those tasks identified as principal or assistant principal "work" common to all three studies, previously unranked duties or the duties that appeared for the first time in the 1997-98 rankings and which indicated possible changes in the assistant principal's role were not considered in the analyses. However, when hypothetical data are used for the previously unranked duties in a simulated comparison, results suggest that assistant principals' work indeed may have changed over the past 30 years. Similarly, when lists of assistant principals' "top ten" highest-ranked duties from the 1983, 1988, and 1998 studies are inspected, only four duties remain common to all three studies: student discipline, school policies, student attendance, and special arrangements at start/close of school (Austin and Brown, 1970; Kalla, 1983; Pellicer et al., 1988).

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

At least three general conclusions may be drawn from the study's findings. First, the demographics for principal and assistant principal interns are generally similar. However, assistant principal interns do not engage in the same work nor do they assume administrative duties with similar degrees of responsibility as do their intern counterparts. These work differences between the two roles are found at the elementary, middle, and high school levels – elementary, middle, and high. Likewise, no significant differences are found between the work of male and female assistant principal interns except at the elementary school level. And finally, literal, statistical comparisons of the work of 1998 Kentucky assistant principal interns to that of three earlier studies indicate no significant changes (Austin and Brown, 1970; Kalla, 1983; Pellicer et al., 1998). However, in simulated work comparisons, use of hypothetical values for missing, unranked data in earlier studies suggests that assistant principals' work has changed since 1983 and that education reform initiatives have affected the assistant principal's role.

As with any research effort, questions arise that are unanswerable from the data collected. Such is also the case with this study, resulting in several recommendations for further research. First, this study should be replicated in Kentucky, preferably every two years, to document possible changes, if any, in the work of principal and assistant principal interns. Replications of this study in other states would offer insight into the effects of reform initiatives and other changes on both roles. Second, this study provided a job analysis of what principals and assistant principals do on the job. Further research is needed to learn how much time is spent on each duty and in what administrative areas, i.e.,

a time-task analysis. Such data would provide a clearer understanding of the work of principal and assistant principal interns, and perhaps offer insight into the disparity between principal and assistant principal interns' self-reported degree of responsibility on 80 administrative duties.

Finally, the job duty inventory employed in this study utilized a survey instrument developed in the mid-1960s by NASSP-sponsored researchers. The original survey duties were divided into six, NASSP-determined administrative categories or areas that were consistent with then-current theories of educational administration. With Kentucky's recent adoption of the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium's (ISLLC) administrator standards, it seems reasonable to develop a new job duty survey instrument using administrative areas or categories consistent with the six ISLLC standards. Assuming ISLLC standards reflect state-of-the-art thought relative to educational administrative theory, a national study is needed to determine how consistent the ISLLC standards are with current administrative practice, i.e., the actual on-the-job duties of principals and assistant principals.

Appendix A

Principal Interns' Administrative Duty Rankings

Administrative Duties[b]	Rank	Percentage[a]
Building use – school-related	1	100.0
School policies (implementation)	2	100.0
Student discipline	3	100.0
Student & staff safety	4	100.0
Communication of school vision & mission	5	100.0
School budgets	6	100.0
Staff inservice (professional development)	7	100.0
Instructional methods	8	100.0
Development of 1998-2000 Consolidated Plan	9	100.0
Evaluation of teachers	10	98.3
Faculty meetings	11	98.3
Teacher personnel records	12	98.3
Attendance at district- or state-level meetings	13	98.3
Analysis of state assessment and accountability data	14	98.3
Parent interaction or communication	16	98.3
Curriculum development	16	98.3
Teacher selection	16	98.3
Student attendance	18	98.3
Development of school policies & procedures	19	98.3

[a] Percent of respondents indicating "shared" or "full" responsibility for the task.
[b] In regular type: Administrative duties included in the 1987 NASSP survey.
In italics: Administrative duties added by focus group to 1998 survey.

Administrative Duties[b]	Rank	Percentage[a]
Curriculum revision & alignment with core concepts	20	98.3
Teacher incentives & motivation	21	98.3
Administrative representative at community functions	22	96.6
Teacher "duty" rosters	23	96.6
Compliance with local policies, state laws, & regulations	24	96.6
School master schedule	25	96.6
Emergency arrangements	26	96.6
School financial accounts	27	96.6
Student testing program	28	96.6
Special arrangements at start & close of school	29	94.9
Legal rights for staff	30	94.9
Assemblies	31	94.9
SBDM council & committees	32.5	93.2
Legal rights for students	32.5	93.2
Communication of school achievement information	34	93.2
Building use – nonschool-related	35	91.5
Orientation for new teachers	36	91.5
School daily bulletins (announcements)	37	91.5
Substitute teachers	38	91.5
Parent Teacher Association/Organization	39	89.8
Non-instructional equipment & supplies	40	88.1

[a] Percent of respondents indicating "shared" or "full" responsibility for the task.
[b] In regular type: Administrative duties included in the 1987 NASSP survey.
In italics: Administrative duties added by focus group to 1998 survey.

Administrative Duties[b]	Rank	Percentage[a]
Special education (IEP implementation)	41	86.4
Innovations, experiments, & research	42	84.7
School public relations program	43	84.7
Fund raising for school or student activities	44	84.7
Chair committees for special needs students (504s, ARCs)	45	83.1
Custodial services	46	81.4
Clerical services	47	81.4
Instructional media & materials	48	81.4
Extended School Services (ESS)	49	81.4
Computer services	50	79.7
School-wide examinations	51	78.0
School calendars	52	78.0
Instructional software	53	76.3
Textbook selection	54	76.3
Cafeteria services	55	74.6
Transportation services	56	72.9
Student teachers	57	72.9
Coordination of community resources for instruction	58	72.9
Liaison with community agencies	59	71.2
Orientation program for new students	60	71.2
Student photographs	61	69.5
School dances	62	67.8
Athletic program	63	67.8

[a] Percent of respondents indicating "shared" or "full" responsibility for the task.
[b] In regular type: Administrative duties included in the 1987 NASSP survey.
In italics: Administrative duties added by focus group to 1998 survey.

Administrative Duties[b]	Rank	Percentage[a]
School club program	64	66.1
Relationships with educational/employer representatives	65	61.0
Graduation activities	66	59.3
Guidance program	67	55.9
Articulation with feeder schools	68	54.2
School newspaper	69	54.2
School participation in community fund drives	70	52.5
School traffic or safety squad	71	52.5
50% Criterion[c]		
Student store	72	37.3
Instruction for homebound students	73	35.6
Student council	74	32.2
Medical, dental, & health services	75	30.5
Financial aid for students	76	28.8
School assistance to students in transition	77	23.7
Work-study program	78	22.0
School alumni association	79	18.6
Adult education program	80	15.3

[a] Percent of respondents indicating "shared" or "full" responsibility for the task.
[b] In regular type: Administrative duties included in the 1987 NASSP survey.
In italics: Administrative duties added by focus group to 1998 survey.
[c] NASSP's operationally defined "cut off" point for identifying the "work" of principals and assistant principals.

Appendix B

Assistant Principal Interns' Administrative Duty Rankings

Administrative Duty[b]	Rank	Percentage[a]
Student discipline	1	96.0
Parent interaction or communication	2	96.0
Student & staff safety	3	94.7
Compliance with local policies, state laws, & regulations	4	93.3
School policies (implementation)	5	85.3
Assemblies	6	84.0
Student attendance	7	82.7
Special arrangements at start & close of school	8	82.7
Chair committees for special needs students (504s, ARCs)	9	81.3
Development of school policies & procedures	10	81.3
Administrative rep. at community functions	11	78.7
Evaluation of teachers	12	78.7
Teacher "duty" rosters	13	77.3
Attendance at district- and state-level meetings	14	76.0
Faculty meetings	15	74.7
Special education (IEP implementation)	16	72.0
Emergency arrangements	17.5	72.0
Communication of school vision & mission	17.5	72.0
Building use – school-related	19	70.7
Legal rights for students	20	68.0
Development of 1998-2000 Consolidated Plan	21	66.7

[a] Percent of respondents indicating "shared" or "full" responsibility for the duty.
[b] In regular type: Administrative duties included in the 1987 NASSP survey.
In italics: Administrative duties added by focus group to 1998 survey.

Administrative Duty[b]	Rank	Percentage[a]
Transportation services	22	66.7
Staff inservice (professional development)	23	64.0
Orientation for new teachers	24	64.0
Athletic program	25	64.0
School dances	26	64.0
Analysis of state assessment & accountability data	27	62.7
Teacher personnel records	*28*	*61.3*
School daily bulletins (announcements)	29	60.0
SBDM council & committees	30	60.0
Curriculum revision/alignment with core concepts	31	58.7
Teacher incentives, motivation	32	58.7
Student testing program	33.5	57.3
Custodial services	33.5	57.3
Teacher selection	35	57.3
Substitute teachers	36	56.0
Instructional methods	37	54.7
School club program	38	54.7
School traffic or safety squad	39	54.7
Curriculum development	40	53.3
Legal rights for staff	41	53.3
Clerical services	42	50.7
50% Criterion[c]		

[a] Percent of respondents indicating "shared" or "full" responsibility for the duty.
[b] In regular type: Administrative duties included in the 1987 NASSP survey.
In italics: Administrative duties added by focus group to 1998 survey.
[c] NASSP's operationally defined "cut off" point for identifying the "work" of principals and assistant principals.

Administrative Duty[b]	Rank	Percentage[a]
Building use – nonschool-related	43	49.3
School-wide examinations	44	49.3
Cafeteria services	45	49.3
Graduation activities	46	48.0
Non-instructional equipment & supplies	47	46.7
Orientation program for new students	48	46.7
Liaison with community youth-serving agencies	49	46.7
Instructional media & materials	50	45.3
School calendars	51	44.0
School master schedule	52	42.7
Computer services	53	42.7
Extended School Services (ESS)	54	41.3
Innovations, experiments, & research	55	41.3
Articulation with feeder schools	56	41.3
Parent Teacher Association/Organization	57	40.0
Textbook selection	58	38.7
School public relations program	59	38.7
Student teachers	60	38.7
Communication of school achievement information	61	37.3
School budgets	62	37.3
Relationships with educational/employment reps.	63	36.0
Fund raising for school/student activities	64	36.0
Student photographs	65	29.3

[a] Percent of respondents indicating "shared" or "full" responsibility for the duty.
[b] In regular type: Administrative duties included in the 1987 NASSP survey.
In italics: Administrative duties added by focus group to 1998 survey.
[c] NASSP's operationally defined "cut off" point for identifying the "work" of principals and assistant principals.

Administrative Duty[b]	Rank	Percentage[a]
School financial accounts	66	28.0
Instructional software	67	24.0
School participation in community fund raising	68	24.0
Student council	69	21.3
Instruction for homebound students	70	20.0
Coordination of community resources for instruction	71	18.7
Guidance program	72	17.3
School assistance to students in transition	73	17.3
School newspaper	74	16.0
Medical, dental, & health services	75	12.0
Student store	76	9.3
Financial aid for students	77	6.7
Work-study program	78	6.7
Adult education program	79	6.7
School alumni association	80	2.7

[a] Percent of respondents indicating "shared" or "full" responsibility for the duty.
[b] In regular type: Administrative duties included in the 1987 NASSP survey.
In italics: Administrative duties added by focus group to 1998 survey.
[c] NASSP's operationally defined "cut off" point for identifying the "work" of principals and assistant principals.

Appendix C

Administrative Duties Identified by At Least 90% of 1997-98 Interns

Principal Duties[a] (Percentages[b])	Assistant Principal Duties[a] (Percentages[b])
1. Building use – school-related (100%)	1. Student discipline (96%)
2. School policies (implementation) (100%)	2. *Parent interaction/communication* (96.0%)
3. Student discipline (100%)	3. *Student & staff safety* (94.7%)
4. *Student & staff safety* (100%)	4. *Compliance with policies, laws, & regulations* (93.3%)
5. *Communication of school vision & mission* (100%)	
6. Staff inservice (professional development) (100%)	
7. School budgets (100%)	
8. Instructional methods (100%)	
9. *Development of 1998-2000 Consolidated Plan* (100%)	
10. Evaluation of teachers (98.3%)	
11. Faculty meetings (98.3%)	
12. Teacher personnel records (98.3%)	
13. *Attendance at district- or state-level meetings* (98.3%)	
14. *Analysis of state assessment and accountability data* (98.3%)	
15. *Parent interaction or communication* (98.3%)	

[a] In regular type: Administrative duties included in the 1987 NASSP survey.
In italics: Administrative duties added by focus group to 1998 survey.
[b] Percent of respondents indicating "shared" or "full" responsibility for duties.

Principal Duties[a] (Percentages[b])	Assistant Principal Duties[a] (Percentages[b])
16. Curriculum development (98.3%)	
17. Teacher selection (98.3%)	
18. Student attendance (98.3%)	
19. *Development of school policies & procedures* (98.3%)	
20. *Curriculum revision & alignment with core concepts* (98.3%)	
21. Teacher incentives & motivation (96.6%)	
22. Administrative representative at community functions (96.6%)	
23. Teacher "duty" rosters (96.6%)	
24. *Compliance with local policies, state laws, & regulations* (96.6%)	
25. School master schedule (96.6%)	
26. Emergency arrangements (96.6%)	
27. School financial accounts (96.6%)	
28. Student testing program (96.6%)	
29. Special arrangements at start & close of school (94.9%)	
30. *Legal rights for staff* (94.9%)	
31. Assemblies (94.9%)	
32. *SBDM council & committees* (93.2%)	

[a] In regular type: Administrative duties included in the 1987 NASSP survey.
In italics: Administrative duties added by focus group to 1998 survey.
[b] Percent of respondents indicating "shared" or "full" responsibility for duties.

Principal Duties[a] (Percentages[b])	Assistant Principal Duties[a] (Percentages[b])
33. *Legal rights for students* (93.2%)	
34. Communication of school achievement information (93.2%)	
35. Building use – nonschool-related (91.5%)	
36. Orientation for new teachers (91.5%)	
37. School daily bulletins (announcements) (91.5%)	
38. Substitute teachers (91.5%)	

[a] In regular type: Administrative duties included in the 1987 NASSP survey.
In italics: Administrative duties added by focus group to 1998 survey.
[b] Percent of respondents indicating "shared" or "full" responsibility for duties.

REFERENCES

Ancell, B. M. (1987). The role of the assistant principal in junior high schools/middle schools in the state of Illinois. (Doctoral dissertation, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, 1987). Dissertation Abstracts International, 49-07A, 1626.

Auclair, J. A. (1991). The position of the middle school assistant principal as training for the instructional leadership role of the principal. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut, 1991). Dissertation Abstracts International, 52-04A, 1188.

Austin, D. B. (1972). The assistant principal – What does he do? Theory Into Practice, 11(1), 68-72.

Austin, D. B., & Brown, H. L. (1970). Report of the assistant principal. Washington, DC: National Association of Secondary School Principals.

Bell, S. C. (1988). The status, duties, and responsibilities of the assistant principal in secondary schools of Alabama. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Alabama at Birmingham, 1988). Dissertation Abstracts International, 49-11A, 3212.

Biklen, S. K., & Brannigan, M. B. (1980). Women and educational leadership. Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath and Company.

Brown, G. J., & Rentschler, J. E. (1973). Why don't assistant principals get the principalship? NASSP Bulletin, 57(375), 36-47.

Clemons, M. J. (1989). The assistant principal's responsibility in school-based systems. NASSP Bulletin, 73(516), 33-36.

Coppedge, F. L. (1968). The "new" image of the assistant principal. Clearing House, 42(5), 28-287.

Downing, C. R. (1983, November). Enhancing the elementary school assistant principalship: Some findings from research. Paper resented at the annual meeting of the Southern Regional Council on Educational Administration, Knoxville, TN. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 247 657)

Gillespie, T. M. (1961). Assistant principal: Status, duties, and responsibilities. NASSP Bulletin, 43(251), 59.

Golanda, E. L. (1991). Preparing tomorrow's educational leaders: An inquiry regarding the wisdom of utilizing the position of assistant principal as an internship or apprenticeship to prepare future principals. Journal of School Leadership, 1(3), 266-281.

Gorton, D. (1987). Improving the assistant principalship: The principal's contribution, NASSP Bulletin, 71 (501), 1-4.

Gorton, D., & Kattman, B. (1985). The assistant principalship: An underused asset. Principal, 65(2), 6, 39-40.

Greenfield, W. D. (1985). Developing and instructional role for the assistant principal. Education and Urban Society, 18 (1), 7-27.

Greenfield, W. D., Marshall, C., & Reed, D. B. (1986). Experience in the vice principalship: Preparation for leading schools. The Journal of Educational Administration, 24 (1), 107-121.

Iannaccone, L. (1985). Vice-principal research: A window in the building. Education and Urban Society, 18 (1), 121-130.

Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium. (1996). Standards for school leaders. Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers.

Kalla, M. M. (1983). A study of Kentucky assistant principals: Job responsibilities, importance, and satisfaction. (Doctoral dissertation, George Peabody College of Teachers, Vanderbilt University, 1983). Dissertation Abstracts International, 44-10A, 2941.

Kannapel, P. J., Aagaard, L., & Coe, P. (1997, March). Kentucky education reform after six years: Positive results, critical issues. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.

Kelly, G. (1987). The assistant principalship as a training ground for the principalship. NASSP Bulletin, 71(501), 13-20.

Kentucky Administrative Regulations. (1998). 704 KAR 20:470.

Kentucky Department of Education. (1997a). Handbook for Kentucky principal internship program. Frankfort, KY: Office of Teacher Education and Certification.

Kentucky Department of Education. (1997b). Kentucky schools directory. Frankfort, KY: Office of Communications, Planning, and Governmental Relations.

Kentucky Revised Statues. (1996). KRS 161.027.

Kindsvatter, R., & Tosi, D. J. (1971). Assistant principal: A job in limbo. The Clearing House, April 1971, 456-464.

Kolb, D. A. (1984). Experiential learning: Experiences as the source of learning and development. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

LaCost, B., & Pounder, D. (1987, October). The internship: An alternative model. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the University Council for Education Administration, Charlottesville, VA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 295 306)

Laughery, W. W. (1959). Expedience or vision in the assignment of assistant principals' duties? NASSP Bulletin, 43(243), 112-114.

Marshall, C. (1992). The assistant principal: An overview of the frustrations, rewards. NASSP Bulletin, 76(547), 88-94.

Marshall, C., & Greenfield, W. D. (1985). The socialization of the assistant principal: Implications for school leadership. Education and Urban Society, 18(1), 3-6.

Mizelle, T. K. (1995). An examining of the role of assistant principal in high schools in Virginia that are restructuring. (Doctoral dissertation, Old Dominion University, 1995). Dissertation Abstracts International, 56-10A, 3807.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). A nation at risk: The imperative for education reform. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Panyako, D., & Rorie, L. (1987). The changing role of the assistant principal. NASSP Bulletin, 71 (501), 23-30.

Pellicer, L. O., Anderson, L. W., Keefe, J. W., Kelley, E. A., & McCleary, L. E. (1988). High school leaders and their schools. Volume I: A national profile. Reston, VA: National Association of Secondary School Principals.

Reed, D. B., & Himmler, A. H. (1985). The work of the secondary assistant principal: A field study. Education and Urban Society, 18(1), 59-84.

Schmieder, J. H., McGrevin, C. Z., & Townley, A. J. (1994). Keys to success: Critical skills for novice principals. Journal of School Leadership, 4(3), 272-293.

Smith, J. A. (1987). Assistant principals: New demands, new realities, and new perspectives. NASSP Bulletin, 71(501), 9-12.

Southern Regional Education Board. (1998). Educational benchmarks 1998. Atlanta, GA: Southern Regional Education Board.

SPSS® Base 7.5 Applications Guide. (1997). Chicago, IL: SPSS, Incorporated.

Van Maanan, J., & Schein, E. H. (1979). Toward a theory of organizational socialization. In Research in Organizational Behavior, (Vol. 1). (pp. 209-264). Greenwich, CT: JAI Publications.

Walker, A. D., Choy, C. K., & Tin, L. G. (1993). Principalship training through mentoring: The Singapore experience. Journal of Educational Administration, 31 (4), 33-50.

White, K. A. (1998). At the head of the class: Quality counts '98. Education Week, Vol. XVII. Number 17, 161-163.